UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

ANTHONY RAYMONÉ CLARK,)
Plaintiff,)
v.) Case No. CIV-23-774-0
DR. COLE et al.,)
Defendants.))

ORDER

Plaintiff Anthony Raymoné Clark, a state prisoner appearing pro se, filed a Complaint (Doc. No. 1) and a Supplement thereto (Doc. No. 11) alleging deprivations of his constitutional rights against two defendants. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), the matter was referred to Magistrate Judge Amanda Maxfield Green for initial proceedings.

On November 3, 2023, Judge Green issued a Report and Recommendation ("R. & R.," Doc. No. 12), recommending that the dismissal of all claims. *See id.* at 2-15 (citing 28 U.S.C. § 1915A).

Plaintiff timely filed an Objection to the R. & R. See Doc. No. 14. Plaintiff also has filed a Motion to Supplement (Doc. No. 16), which the Court grants insofar as its contents have been considered together with Plaintiff's Objection herein. Pursuant to controlling authority, the Court reviews de novo the portions of the R. & R. to which specific objections have been made. See United States v. 2121 E. 30th St., 73 F.3d 1057, 1060 (10th Cir. 1996); 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3).

Plaintiff's Objection and Supplement supply additional factual allegations to those

already presented in the Complaint and considered by Judge Green. See Pl.'s Obj. at 1-4;

Pl.'s Suppl. at 1-4. Nothing therein, or in Plaintiff's accompanying argument and exhibits,

evinces any error in Judge Green's findings or requires any modification to her

conclusions. Accordingly, Plaintiff's Objection is overruled.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Report and Recommendation (Doc. No. 12) is

ADOPTED in its entirety. Plaintiff's claims challenging the State's jurisdiction, the

validity of his state-court conviction, and the validity of the Oklahoma Department of

Corrections' policies, as well as his claim for deliberate indifference to serious medical

needs, are DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE. Plaintiff's claims for illegal search and

seizure and for violation of procedural due process are DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE.

Plaintiff's Motion (Doc. No. 13) is DENIED AS MOOT. Plaintiff's Motion to

Supplement (Doc. No. 16) is GRANTED as outlined herein.

A separate judgment shall be entered.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 16th day of April, 2024.

CHARLES B. GOODWIN

United States District Judge

2